

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action of May 20, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Hiraike et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,718). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 have each been amended to claim that the font data to be transmitted comprises a character identifier associated with a character image, the character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two data bytes.

Claims 7, 14 and 20 have been amended to correct informalities.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 18 and 19 have been canceled.

Regarding claims 1-4 and 7:

Independent claim 1, as amended, claims a method for transmitting arbitrary font data to an output device. It is determined whether rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is resident on the output device. If the rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is not resident on the output device, rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is transmitted to the output device. The font data to be transmitted comprises a character identifier associated with a character image, the character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two data bytes.

Since Applicants' claimed invention claims a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier, characters from fonts that require multiple byte identifiers are supported, including, for example, characters from ideographic character-based languages such as Chinese. (Specification, page 6, lines 29-37).

This is clearly unlike *Hiraike*, which fails to disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two bytes. *Hiraike* discloses an information processing apparatus for causing a printer to execute a printing operation by registering a font therein. (*Hiraike*, Abstract). The Examiner argues that *Hiraike* teaches a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including two or more data bytes, however, Applicants respectfully disagree. (Office Action of 5/20/2004, page 3). To support the Examiner's argument, the Examiner cites col. 7, lines 45-62 of *Hiraike*. (Id.) However, that passage from *Hiraike* merely teaches that character data 4001 are composed of a registration ID, which is a number for identifying a registered character. Unlike Applicants' claim 1, nowhere does *Hiraike* disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier

including at least two bytes. Therefore, *Hiraike* fails to disclose or even suggest claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Regarding claims 8-11 and 14:

Independent claim 8, as amended, claims a computer program product comprising computer program code for a method for transmitting arbitrary font data to an output device. Similar to claim 1, the font data to be transmitted comprises a character identifier associated with a character image, the character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two data bytes.

This is clearly unlike *Hiraike*, which fails to disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two bytes. *Hiraike* discloses an information processing apparatus for causing a printer to execute a printing operation by registering a font therein. (*Hiraike*, Abstract). The Examiner argues that *Hiraike* teaches a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including two or more data bytes, however, Applicants respectfully disagree. (Office Action of 5/20/2004, page 3). To support the Examiner's argument, the Examiner cites col. 7, lines 45-62 of *Hiraike*. (Id.) However, that passage from *Hiraike* merely teaches that character data 4001 are composed of a registration ID, which is a number for identifying a registered character. Unlike Applicants' claim 8, nowhere does *Hiraike* disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two bytes. Therefore, *Hiraike* fails to disclose or even suggest claim 8.

Claims 9-11 and 14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 8 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

Regarding claims 15-17 and 20:

Independent claim 15, as amended, claims an apparatus comprising a memory coupled to a processor, and storing computer code implementing a method of transmitting arbitrary font data to an output device. The font data to be transmitted comprises a character identifier associated with a character image, the character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two data bytes.

This is clearly unlike *Hiraike*, which fails to disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two bytes. *Hiraike* discloses an information processing apparatus for causing a printer to execute a printing operation by

registering a font therein. (*Hiraike*, Abstract). The Examiner argues that *Hiraike* teaches a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including two or more data bytes, however, Applicants respectfully disagree. (Office Action of 5/20/2004, page 3). To support the Examiner's argument, the Examiner cites col. 7, lines 45-62 of *Hiraike*. (Id.) However, that passage from *Hiraike* merely teaches that character data 4001 are composed of a registration ID, which is a number for identifying a registered character. Unlike Applicants' claim 15, nowhere does *Hiraike* disclose or even suggest a character identifier comprising a multiple byte identifier including at least two bytes. Therefore, *Hiraike* fails to disclose or even suggest claim 15.


Claims 16-17 and 20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 15 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 1-4, 7-11, 14-17 and 20 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)